DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 571 CS 208 047

AUTHOR Agosta, Lucien L.
TITLE Implementing the CCCC Guidelines for Evaluating Composition Instruction: Procedures, Problems, and Perspectives.
PUB DATE [Mar 83]
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (34th, Detroit, MI, March 17-19, 1983). Appendices are in small print.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Course Evaluation; Educational Objectives; *Evaluation Criteria; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Student Attitudes; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Effectiveness; Writing Improvement; *Writing Processes; Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Freshman Composition

ABSTRACT

The six evaluation instruments recommended by the Committee on Teaching and Its Evaluation of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) were modified to evaluate a large freshman writing program taught by inexperienced instructors. As course goals were clearly stated in the instructor's guide and repeated in orientation and training sessions, one instrument--the determination of standards for judging writing--was eliminated. The program's large size and the instructors' apprehension over being evaluated also militated against three other instruments--the evaluation of teacher commentary on papers, classroom observation, and assessment of writing assignments. The program evaluation, therefore, consisted of revised versions of teacher and student questionnaires. Results revealed some divergence between stated program goals and actual practice, with less time being given to prewriting, invention, and revision than was recommended. The greater stress placed on the writing process by teachers trained in the new apprenticeship program, however, indicated that the apprenticeship approach helped in the course's transition from product to process orientation. A disparity between student and teacher assessments of writing improvement indicated the need for fuller communication of goals. Although using only two instruments, the evaluation did produce significant new information on the program's effectiveness. (Evaluation instruments are appended.) (MM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Lucien L. Agosta
Department of English
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas 66506

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lucien L. Agosta
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED240571

# Implementing the CCCC Guidelines for Evaluating Composition Instruction: Procedures, Problems, and Perspectives

The CCCC Committee on Teaching and Its Evaluation in Composition has devised a set of six instruments to be used in evaluating the effectiveness of a composition teacher, course, or composition program as a whole (CCC, May 1982, 213-229). Briefly, these six instruments consist of 1) a determination of "the assumptions, goals, and standards for judging writing" which underlie a program or course; 2) a questionnaire for teachers allowing them "to decide and to evaluate their own courses"; 3) an evaluation of classroom activities through observation by colleagues; 4) an assessment of the writing assignments or "invitations for writing" given to students; 5) an evaluation of teacher commentary on student papers; and 6) a questionnaire designed to obtain student judgment of their instruction.

This set of instruments is ideal for evaluating an individual composition teacher or course, but for evaluating a whole composition program it is ideal only if that composition program is moderate in size and staffed by secure instructors tolerant of extensive probing into their attitudes and practices and willing to devote considerable time in a busy semester to filling out evaluation forms and cooperating with various evaluators who must schedule class visits, reviews of paper assignments, and examination of the commentary made in reaction to student writing. (Of course this is a description of a program which probably does not need to be evaluated.) In short, the CCCC Committee's evaluation instruments are ideal for evaluating an entire composition program--but only if that composition program is itself ideal in size and in staff attitude towards the evaluation.

CS208047

Now I would like to talk about what I imagine would happen when an ideal set of evaluation instruments such as those devised by the CCCC Committee is introduced into a less than ideal writing program such as the one I direct. I imagine that the meeting of our 60 instructors with the members of the Evaluation Committee would resemble the first meeting of the little girl with the Extra-Terrestrial in E.T.: they would both throw up their arms, wave their hands, and scream in horror at the sight of each other. As director of a large composition program employing a large number of inexperienced and thus understandably insecure instructors, I was forced to modify the CCCC Committee's evaluation instruments--some might say radically--in order to use them in an evaluation of our composition program. In this paper I want to discuss my reasons for modifying the instruments, the modifications I made, and the information I derived from the instruments we used.

My reasons for modifying the CCCC Committee's instruments for our program evaluation have already been hinted at: the size of our program and the prevailing departmental attitude to teacher and course evaluations were both factors prohibiting the direct adoption of the CCCC evaluation procedures. Our program employs 60 instructors teaching 130 sections of Composition I and II a semester, each section enrolling approximately 25 students for a total enrollment of 3,250. Though there are certainly larger programs, ours is large enough to insure severe logistical problems in implementing certain of the CCCC Committee's instruments, especially the third, fourth, and fifth. If, for example, we were to use the third instrument, we would have to visit at least 60 classes during a given semester. The fourth instrument would require the assessment of approximately 360 separate writing assignments given by our 60 teachers. Since our instructors are encouraged to devise assignments that draw on skills exercised in previous assignments and that prepare students for accomplishing the next writing task,

assessment of a random sampling of assignments would not provide us with particularly useful information. The fifth instrument would require evaluation of the marked and graded papers of 3,250 students. If all 60 instructors handed the evaluators five papers during a semester, that would still be 300 papers to process, and the evaluators would have no way of knowing how typical the commentary and markings were. On top of the enormous expenditures of time and energy spent on observing and assessing, the evaluators would have to monitor each other to insure that idiosyncratic assessments did not distort the evaluation procedures.

But size was not the only difficulty in implementing the CCCC Guidelines for evaluation of our composition program. I also had to contend with a prevailing negative attitude towards evaluation of instruction in my department. Class visits, assessments of writing assignments, and examination of instructor comments on papers would obviously not be welcomed by a faculty characterized by profound distrust of instructional evaluation conducted either by colleagues or by students. This opposition to evaluation, strong in our permanent faculty, is even stronger among the composition staff, which consists of teaching assistants who are often inexperienced and understandably insecure, and temporary instructors who are appointed to renewable yearly contracts and who thus feel particularly vulnerable. This opposition to evaluation was first made clear to me when, on becoming Director of Composition, I tried to institute required student evaluations of all sections of composition for the first time. This was accepted by the staff only after a compromise was reached: the results of these evaluations were to be released only to individual teachers. This attitude made it nearly impossible to implement the CCCC Committee's third, fourth, and fifth instruments in our program evaluation. (I introduce this peculiarity of our department not in any way to complain, but only to indicate that every department has its own quirks which may determine the extent of modifications required before a department

will accept the evaluation procedures.)

In spite of these problems of attitude and size, I wanted to conduct an evaluation of our composition program to get a better idea of how our staff was adapting to the process approach to teaching composition which has become a fundamental part of our program during the last several years. I knew, first of all, that in order to gain full participation from a staff jittery about evaluations and to encourage frank staff response I would have to assure them of complete anonymity. I also decided that it would be far too ambitious for me to conduct a program evaluation of both of our freshman courses simultaneously. Consequently, I decided to conduct the program evaluation over our Composition I course since this is the course all freshmen are required to take. This decision, however, did little to alleviate the problems posed by program size. Of 60 instructors, 48 were teaching 100 sections of Composition I during the fall 1982 term with an enrollment of approximately 2,500 students.

After these preliminary decisions, I set about tailoring the CCCC instruments for a closer fit to our program. Since I had promised anonymity and since the size of the program make them impractical, I eliminated class visits, assessments of writing assignments, and evaluation of teacher comments on student papers (instruments 3, 4, and 5). Instrument 1, which asks "that departments and administrators determine the assumptions, goals, and standards for judging writing that underlie the program or course, and that evaluators of instruction be familiar with all of these" (p. 217), was satisfied in that these concerns are, I think, clearly spelled out in the course description, in a 93-page Instructor's Guide to the Program, in the initial two-day orientation to the program, in weekly teaching apprenticeship training sessions for new teachers, and in occasional meetings of the entire composition staff. Thus I assumed that the official "goals, assumptions, and standards" were clear to the entire staff.

Our program evaluation, then, consisted of revised versions of the two instruments remaining from the set of six: instrument 2 (the teacher questionnaire) and instrument 6 (the student questionnaire). I restructured both questionnaires so that they would interlock in what I hoped would be telling ways. I included in our teacher questionnaire four parts, three of which were adapted with minor changes in wording from the CCCC instrument. Our Part I asked for the frequency with which teachers engaged their classes in 15 instructional activities, such as prewriting exercises, class discussion of student writing, etc. Part II asked for the degree of importance attached to active instruction in 25 areas, including coming up with ideas for use in writing, supporting main ideas, and revising paper organization. Part III, for which there was no corresponding part in the CCCC questionnaire, asked instructors to assess overall student improvement in the 25 areas included in Part II. Part III of our survey was a crucial addition: I hoped that it would force teachers to judge, through their own assessments of general student improvement, whether their instructional activities and emphases as examined in Parts I and II were actually paying off in student performance. Part IV asked for an outline of the sequence of writing assignments used in the course and a rationale for that sequence. The responses to Parts I, II, and III were tabulated by computer. The questionnaire itself, however, was not designed merely to give percentages; it was to be used to help teachers to realize where they were making the heaviest instructional investments in time and emphasis and where those investments were paying profitable dividends in student performance.

In order to make the student questionnaire mesh better with the revised teacher questionnaire, I whittled CCCC instrument 6 down from 5 parts to 2, the first of which asked students to assess their own improvement in the same 25 areas their teachers had assessed student improvement on in Part III of the

teacher questionnaire. Part II of the student questionnaire attempted to gather data about whether or not students felt more confident about their writing abilities after having taken Composition I. It also asked students to comment on teacher evaluation of their writing and the degree of respect accorded their writing by their instructors. Again, the results of this questionnaire were tabulated by computer.

Because we had a check-in list, all 48 composition instructors returned their questionnaires. Of the estimated 2,500 freshmen enrolled in Composition I for the fall 1982 term, 1752 returned computer cards. Since the evaluation was conducted during the penultimate week of the semester, many of the freshmen who did not return cards had apparently dropped the course or were late or absent on the day the evaluation was administered.

These revised program evaluation instruments were actually more effective than I had imagined they would be in providing information about the three areas of concern which originally prompted this program evaluation. First, I wanted to know the extent of convergence between announced or "official" course goals, assumptions, and standards and actual teacher goals, assumptions, and standards as revealed in classroom practice. Second, I wanted to gauge the impact on our staff of our new Teacher Apprenticeship Program. Third, I wanted to hear from students themselves their own assessments and reactions to the course they were required to take.

The first of these three concerns was the most important in that it asked if instructors in the program were committed to the stated goals of the program and reflected these goals in their classrooms. Officially, Composition I aims to make the composing processes of our students more efficient and productive by equipping them with diverse discovery procedures and ways of exploring a subject before writing, with various strategies for arranging and organizing the material generated in the discovery stage, with numerous stylistic alternatives for

constructing sentences to convey effectively the writer's intention to the reader, and with enough editing savy to allow an audience to process the completed text without difficulty or offense. The program is, then, firmly dedicated to the teaching of writing as process. Instructors are encouraged to take a cyclical approach to writing instruction. In other words, for every writing assignment, instruction is to be offered in each of the stages of the composing process--rehearsing, drafting, reformulating, and editing--as the student is going through those stages in the writing of a paper. In short, the goals and assumptions of our Composition I course are clearly specified: they argue for a way of teaching writing as process with proportionate and balanced instructional emphasis on invention, arrangement, style, and editing for each paper.

Unfortunately, the figures derived from our teacher questionnaire revealed less than complete convergence between the official goals of the program and actual teacher practice. For example, only 50% of our instructors claimed that they spent much classroom time on prewriting or invention; 31.3% claimed to deal with it only occasionally, while 14.5% responded that they seldom mentioned the issue in class.[1] The official course syllabus, however, exhorts instructors to spend a substantial amount of time on prewriting in the writing cycles and attempts to instruct them in ways of going about it. The questionnaire also revealed that rewriting or reformulating is not receiving an emphasis equal to the amount specified in the official course syllabus and provided for in the sample writing cycles. For example, only 35.4% of our instructors claimed to deal with required revision of ideas and organization; 27.1% claimed occasional attention to the

---

[1] I will not provide complete percentage figures for each item, though they are certainly available. For example, on this item in the questionnaire, 4.2% of the instructors (or 2 out of the 48) did not reply. To prevent cluttering this paper with numbers, I have omitted percentages like the one above as irrelevant to the main points being made.

issue, and 27.1% claimed they seldom attended to the matter. Active instruction in stylistic options and sentence combining did not receive the emphasis encouraged in the official course syllabus either: only 20.8% claimed they dealt frequently with matters of style, while 39.6% admitted only occasional attention to it and 33.3% dealt with it only seldom.

Clearly the emphasis of most of our teachers--as revealed in the evaluation questionnaire--was on instruction in arrangement and organization. A full 75% of instructors thought that teaching their students to state a main idea or thesis as the backbone of a paper was of major importance, a sentiment which I certainly share, though this percentage is revealing when ranged alongside the considerably lower percentages of instructors who considered teaching invention and style important. About instruction in overall organization, 62.5% of instructors felt it was of major importance, while 31.3% claimed it was somewhat important. In short, the questionnaire showed that the major instructional emphasis in our Composition I program is on organization and arrangement, with considerably less emphasis on invention and style.

There are several reasons for this emphasis on arrangement. In the first place, our dedication to process in the composition program dates back only 2½ years. Before our present emphasis, our Composition I course was designed solely to teach the 500-word, 5-paragraph theme with its tri-partite thesis sentence and its introduction, three-paragraph body, and conclusion. There was no attention to prewriting and little attention to reformulating. The teacher questionnaire shows that old habits die hard, and simply because a program undergoes a switch in goals and procedures does not mean that instructors can or will follow the new program right away. In the second place, I have spent so much time devising a teacher apprenticeship program for our new TAs that I neglected retraining programs for the entire staff. The process texts we use

and the process syllabus alone have apparently not been as successful as I would have liked in accomplishing this retraining.

Thus, the answers received from the teacher questionnaire demonstrate that ou Composition I program is still in transition from a traditional, product-oriented one to a program which recognizes writing as a process, which recognizes that instruction must not focus on what makes for "good prose" in the abstract, but on what will make the prose the students are currently working on good.

In addition, the teacher questionnaire provided information which addressed the second of my concerns--whether or not our new Teacher Apprenticeship Program was effective in training new TAs. I was able to identify apprentice instructors--who numbered 15 out of the 48--because most of them listed, under Part IV of the teacher questionnaire, the same sequence of assignments used by their counselors and discussed in weekly planning sessions. I was gratified to learn that a large majority of the new teachers indicated on the questionnaire that they emphasized invention, arrangement, style, and editing proportionately in their courses. In short, their answers suggested that the courses they taught under direction were more nearly the process courses described in the syllabus. I attribute this to their experiences in our new Teacher Apprenticeship Program. Other instructors, however, gave sequences of assignments which strongly suggested that they were teaching what I call product-oriented, pattern-stuffing courses in which they gave their students rigid, pre-ordained patterns and then told their students to find a content to stuff those patterns with. Now according to their completed questionnaires, these instructors by and large emphasized arrangement and organization, more often than not to the exclusion of any apparent instruction in invention and style. Certain data from the teaching questionnaire suggest, then, that the Apprenticeship Program is working well, that it is a most effective

means for bringing about a greater convergence of program objectives and actual teaching practice. As a result of these findings, I am contemplating expanding the required apprenticeship program from one semester to two so that new instructors will teach under supervision and meet for weekly planning sessions for their entire first year.

The third concern which prompted this program review was addressed by our questionnaire for determining student assessment of the course and what students felt they had learned in it. Interestingly enough there was considerable divergence between teacher assessments of student improvement on the one hand and student assessments of their own improvement on the other. Most surprising, perhaps, was the divergence between teacher and student assessments of improvement in organization and development, skills which, according to data derived from the teacher questionnaire, many instructors emphasized in the course. On such skills as stating a main idea or thesis, and developing the thesis through the citing of specific details, teachers were much more optimistic about student improvement than were their students. For example, although 58.3% of instructors felt students showed considerable improvement in stating a controlling idea or thesis, only 26.3% of the students felt they had improved very much, though an additional 45.5% conceded that they had improved somewhat. On the other hand, students were considerably more optimistic about their improvement in reformulating and revising skills than were their teachers. For example, though only 12.5% of instructors saw considerable improvement in student ability to revise paper organization (another 70.8% saw <u>some</u> improvement), a full 23.1% of students felt they had very much improved in this area, another 39.2% felt they had improved somewhat, and 27.7% admitted a little improvement. Though students often judge improvement solely on the basis of receiving better grades as the semester progresses, these figures nevertheless suggest that perhaps students and teachers

do not fully share common and mutually understood goals, assumptions, and standards as underpinnings for this course. Perhaps if they shared those goals and assumptions there might be greater convergence of teacher-student assessment of the course and its effect on the students enrolled in it.

More encouraging than the disparity between student and teacher assessments of student improvement was the number of students who felt increased confidence in themselves as a result of having taken the course. A full 85.1% of the students claimed to feel better able to write in response to an assignment, and 63% indicated they were now more willing to undertake future writing tasks. In addition, 51.6% of students claimed to be more willing now to take college courses which require writing and 44.2% felt more willing to take jobs in which they would be expected to write. I attended carefully to these student assessments of the course because they help to provide a gauge as to how well or how ill we are accomplishing the overall goal of our program, the goal of helping our students to become competent and confident writers, adept at writing effectively in a number of different situations and under various formal constraints.

In conclusion, the information we derived from our use of the modified CCCC Committee's evaluation instruments was revealing and significant. What we learned, we will use: the information derived will help us to plan procedures for bolstering the strengths and remedying the weaknesses revealed in the evaluation of our program. Admittedly our program evaluation relied on only two of the six instruments and thus failed to conform to the CCCC Committee's admonition that "only by bringing together the information furnished by three or four of our instruments. . . can a teacher or faculty determine in what ways a program, course, or teacher is more effective and in what ways less effective." (p. 217) I hope that I have offered sufficient justification for using only

two instruments. I also hope that I have shown that these two instruments did reveal information important in an accurate assessment of program effectiveness. My defense for taking such liberties in modifying the instruments has been made elsewhere in this paper, but let me repeat it here: those who administer a less than ideal composition program can use this set of ideal evaluation instruments only by bending, shaping, stretching and molding them until they fit the peculiar features of the program to be evaluated. The evaluation procedure which results after the bending and shaping may look different from its source--kind of like a blonde born to brunette parents--but it is of the same flesh and blood after all.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSTRUCTORS — Answer on these sheets.

Part I: Instructional Activities

Using this code, indicate how frequently your class engaged in the following activities:

1 - Often
2 - Occasionally
3 - Seldom
4 - Never
5 - Not relevant

| | | Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never | Not Relevant |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Prewriting exercises | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. | Class discussion of professional writing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | Discussion of ideas derived from readings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. | Class discussion of student writing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. | Reading about writing (in a composition textbook, for example) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. | Listening to lectures on various aspects of composition | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. | Exercises in manipulating sentences (Sentence Combining, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. | Sentence drills or grammar exercises | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. | Small group activities or workshops | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. | Instructor-student conferences or tutorials | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. | Essay writing in class | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. | Essay writing outside of class | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. | Required revising of ideas and organization | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. | Required grammatical and stylistic revision of sentences | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. | Quizzes or short graded exercises | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |



Part II: Instructional Emphasis

Using this code, indicate the importance you attached to each of the following. ("Importance" is determined by the amount of time and energy spent during the course in actively instructing your students in the following areas.)

1 - Major/important
2 - Somewhat important
3 - Not very important
4 - Not at all important
5 - Not relevant

In this course, I tried to teach my students how to--

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Come up with ideas for use in writing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. | Define an issue for use in writing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | State a main idea | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. | Support main ideas | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. | Use appropriate details | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. | Locate sources of details | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. | Plan papers before writing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. | Organize papers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. | Provide transitional cues to guide a reader | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. | Recognize different tones in writing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. | Adjust their writing styles according to the needs of their readers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. | Adjust their writing styles according to the purpose of their writing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. | Judge their own writing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. | Ask questions about problems they face in their writing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. | Judge other students' writing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. | Use other people's comments to help them improve their writing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. | Select appropriate words | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. | Learn new words | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. | Revise the organization of papers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. | Revise sentences | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 21. | Revise ideas | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. | Correct their own mistakes in punctuation and grammar | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. | Use a dictionary when needed | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. | Take essay tests | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25. | Extend the principles learned in this class to writing in other classes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Part III: Student Writing Skills as Determined by Instructor

Using this code, indicate as best you can whether the majority of the class made improvements in the ability to--

1 - Considerable improvement
2 - Some improvement
3 - No improvement
4 - Needed no improvement
5 - Not relevant

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Come up with ideas for use in writing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. | Define an issue for use in writing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | State a main idea | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. | Support main ideas | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. | Use appropriate details | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. | Locate sources of details | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. | Plan papers before writing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. | Organize papers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. | Provide transitional cues to guide a reader through a text | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. | Recognize different tones in writing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. | Adjust their writing styles according to the needs of their readers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. | Adjust their writing styles according to the purpose of their writing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. | Judge their own writing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. | Ask questions about problems they face in their writing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |



| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15. | Judge other students' writing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. | Use other people's comments to help them improve their writing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. | Select appropriate words | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. | Learn new words | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. | Revise the organization of papers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. | Revise sentences | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. | Revise ideas | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. | Correct their own mistakes in punctuation and grammar | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. | Use a dictionary when needed | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. | Take essay tests | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25. | Extend the principles learned in this class to writing in other classes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Part IV: Writing Assignments

1. Briefly explain your approach to assigning topics for papers. In other words, what developmental rationale seemed to shape your successive writing assignments?

2. What were the successive writing assignments in your class? (Brief titles or descriptions of the topics assigned)

3. What changes would you make in the nature or sequence of the assignments if you taught the course again?

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

Part I: Using the following code, indicate on the computer card the extent to which you think this course helped to improve your ability to--

1 - Very much
2 - Somewhat
3 - A little
4 - Not at all
5 - Not covered in this class

1. Come up with ideas for use in writing
2. Define an issue to write about
3. State a main idea
4. Support your main ideas
5. Use appropriate details
6. Locate sources of details
7. Plan papers before you write
8. Organize your papers
9. Provide transitional cues to guide a reader through your papers
10. Use appropriately varied tones in your writing
11. Adjust your writing style according to the needs of your readers
12. Adjust your writing style according to the purpose of your writing
13. Judge your own writing
14. State for yourself questions about your problems in writing
15. Judge other students' writing
16. Use other people's comments to improve your writing
17. Choose words that say what you mean
18. Learn new words
19. Revise the organization of your papers
20. Revise your sentences
21. Revise your ideas
22. Correct your own mistakes in punctuation and grammar
23. Use a dictionary when needed
24. Take essay tests
25. Write in other courses



Part II: Use the following code for this section of the questionnaire and indicate your answer on the computer card:

1 - Strongly agree
2 - Agree
3 - Disagree
4 - Strongly disagree
5 - Not relevant

After taking this class, I believe that--

26. I am better able to do my writing assignments
27. I am more willing to undertake writing tasks
28. I have increased confidence in myself as a writer
29. I am more willing to take jobs that may require writing
30. I am more willing to take courses that may require writing
31. Writing can help me learn
32. Writing helps me to clarify my ideas
33. The teacher's evaluation of my writing seemed fair
34. My writing was treated with respect
35. My teacher was regularly prepared for class
36. I felt comfortable submitting my writing to my teacher
37. My teacher's comments on my writing were clear.